National Socialism Contra Fascism

DER EINZIGE
APR 08, 2025

100 39 25 Share



> *"One might almost say that fascism has reacted upon the creative life of the Italian people somewhat like a sterilization. It is, after all,* ***nothing like National Socialism****. While the latter goes deep down to the roots, fascism is only a superficial thing. That is regrettable, but one must recognize it clearly. National Socialism is really a way of life [eine Weltanschauung]. It always begins at the beginning and lays new foundations for life. That's why our task is so difficult, but also so beautiful, and the goal ahead is well worth our best effort."*
>
> — Joseph Goebbels, Diary entry, February 6, 1942

Fascism & NS have been lumped together for decades, becoming more common as the years pass. Even worse than being lumped in as 'identical' ideologies, some even believe that Fascism is an umbrella ideology which supersedes all of the various RW groups in Europe during the interwar period from Franco's nationalists to the SS. Like much of the ideological RW, many of these groups did not get along. Not only for geopolitical reasons, but ideological ones as well.

I should mention that this isn't something limited to those who aren't knowledgeable on the relevant fields. Plenty of people who are fairly well versed in RW politics make the same mistake. Plenty of *self proclaimed NatSocs* fail to see the difference. Even the IronMarch writers used both terms interchangeably in trying to syncretize the various nationalist movements of the time. This also isn't a new phenomenon, both Dr. Pierce & Colin Jordan felt the need to write about the issue all the way back in the 1980's. For a few reasons, I don't necessarily blame anyone for making this mistake but still feel it should be understood properly.

The most obvious historical example of the sheer difference between the two ideologies is the annexation of Austria by NS Germany. ZoomerHistorian has the best video covering this topic. For those unaware, Austria was under a Fascist government by this time. This specific breed of Fascism is usually referred to as *AustroFascism*. The primary difference between it & 'Italian Fascism' is its heavy emphasis on Catholicism. Giovanni Gentile specifically crafted the philosophical framework of Fascism to be compatible with Catholicism at the time, but the Austrians gave it center stage.

Regardless, the AustroFascist government of Dalfuss had considerable trouble with political radicals that increased exponentially over time. Unlike its more developed neighbors, the threat from the Left was fairly minor as they were mostly beaten during the recent civil war. The threat was instead the internal National Socialist movement. The obvious difference that caused the conflict between these groups was that Austria shouldn't exist under an NS worldview. Austria, which was now independent from its non-German counterparts within the deceased Empire, was always meant to be part of Germany. The pan-Germanic ideology of the NSDAP only added to this.

This leads to the most pressing issue that separates NS from Fascism. Within a Fascist framework, borders truly are imaginary lines on a map. The importance of them is that they show the only limit to State sovereignty. Formal borders are practically irrelevant in NS, which is far more concerned with blood. This is why they annexed lands with significant numbers of Germans, including all of Austria & most of Northwest Europe. This is hugely important for us today, as a Fascist government in the US (á la Mussolini's NFP) would be virtually inconsequential beyond increasing the State's power. It would be Civic Nationalist, which doctrinal Fascism is inherently. Moreover, it would likely take the same form as the Austrian system - oppression of not only National Socialists but any pro-White ideologues.

Those who haven't read into the ideological roots behind Fascism commonly fail to grasp its profoundly backwards idea of the State. They saw the State as the supreme authority & an end in itself. They believed that the *State created the nation*. A good parallel is people who think that the law determines morality rather than vice versa. This concept is as abhorrent to the NatSoc as it is to any leftist. NS is strictly Organicist, one of many elements inherited from preexisting movements within German Idealism, Romanticism, & the Volkische movement. The State is not deified, as it is under Fascism. In fact, its only purpose is to protect the *Volk*.

People are often confused when I bring up that National Socialism does not *necessarily* require a fully totalitarian government, or even an authoritarian one. However, theoretically you could have an extremely small government as the State only exists for a purpose, a means to an end. If there are no internal or external threats, the State doesn't need to exercise grandiose powers. It certainly has these powers at all times (much like all governments, once you look past ideological pretensions about "limited powers"), but doesn't need to glorify the State in itself without an actual need.

This isn't an outright criticism of Statism, which I have no particular animosity towards, but does show a harsh divide between the worldviews of both. NS is a biological worldview, the genetics of who follows it is ultimately the most important part. Without a *volk*, a nation, it's meaningless to even consider National Socialism. The only NS state that could ever exist in Africa is a colony where there are either no natives around, or the locals become a slave caste for the colonists. Contrast this with Italy's foray into Ethiopia & their long term goals of creating a global empire.

A further differentiation between the two worldviews is that one is revolutionary, while the other can at best be described as conservative. This is a major filter for people wishing to identify as NS, one of the largest ideological hurdles to jump before you can fundamentally "*get it*." National Socialism was always a revolutionary movement, it remained so from 1923 to 1945, and continues today. People often get confused because the NSDAP took power through 'peaceful' means, but once in a blue moon revolutions can come about without vast bloodshed.

NS was never traditionalist, not by contemporary or modern standards. Although Hitler was very fond of the German Empire, he had no interest in restoring it or even superficially emulating it beyond using the traditional White/Black/Red color scheme on the flag. A good example of this is an extended section in Chapter X of Mein Kampf, where Hitler touches on prostitution while speaking about the syphilis epidemic occurring across Europe at that time. What's notable is that he doesn't make a moral condemnation of prostitutes, not to say he speaks of them in a good light. His solution to the Whore Question was the same as the solution to the syphilis issue, encourage people to marry younger. In the same chapter, he very clearly states that the sole purpose of marriage is to bring children. This certainly isn't a revolutionary idea, but does conflict with the traditional view of marriage which is held in Christian societies which holds it as a religious ritual in its own right.

The traditionalism seen in National Socialism, both in theory & praxis, is limited to what can be said to be biological phenomena. For example, support for monogamy is not based on any moral principle but instead on the fact that the 'nuclear family' is the most efficient model in fostering healthy children. The NS government was very open to abandoning traditional values in favor what would better serve the nation. For example, the *Lebensborn* program. For those unaware, most of the mothers in this program were single. The government did not outright discourage this, & actually assisted single mothers with private births & adoption to avoid social stigma. There were cases where promiscuous women who didn't want to be married would become mothers to many children while working in brothels & such. Far from wanting to eradicate this "moral failing," the NSDAP sought to make it a more useful institution that contributed to society instead of just spreading STDs.

I should note that the 'Whore class' has always existed in history, at various points shifting between bottom class criminals & religious figures. It's likely the NSDAP saw the writing on the wall that a certain percentage of women will always end being sexually promiscuous for some reason or another, especially in times of gender imbalance.

Indeed, the original National Socialists had no inclination for pearl clutching or moral panic. Considering that NS is fundamentally a biological worldview, it can be said that harsh & dogmatic moralism (beyond utilitarian concerns) is almost at odds with it.

Fascism, on the other hand, is essentially conservative in these matters. That isn't to say it wanted its own "*End of History*," to simply stop the clock, but it had absolutely no desire to fundamentally shift the paradigm & worldview of its followers. As a broadly RW movement, most of its followers were supportive of the basic moral principles already in place in Italy, of course generally based around Catholicism. A good example of this was the trials & tribulations of the *Syndicalists*. For those unaware, National Syndicalism served as a precursor movement to Italian Fascism, it inherited many Syndicalists that were against Marxism for some reason or another. The most notable example is Edmondo Russolini, a Syndicalist who became a member of the Council of Fascism & betrayed Mussolini during the 1943 coup.

Russolini (I hate Italian names, ridiculous language) & his type sought revolutionary change in the economic system. Syndicalism derives its name from syndicate, which is similar to a guild or trade-wide union. He wanted these syndicates to advocate for the workers, but in a more revolutionary manner than the typical union. Without delving into the weeds of Syndicalism, it would essentially give the collective workers far more power than any business owner & democratize industry, in a sense. (*Note: This is a disservice, please research on your own for a proper description.*) The Fascist government steadily curtailed its Syndicalist wing, even breaking up the nationwide Fascist Syndicate in 1928 which is generally seen as an attempt to cut Russolini's power & end any change in the economic System.

The Fascist government was content with the status quo, not wanting any upsets in the country like a potential class war. This thought process was endemic to the NFP, it can be seen in everything from foreign policy to their interactions with the Vatican. They were allergic to change, & had no ideological motive to cause it. They simply wanted a more all-encompassing State. Even elsewhere in Europe, such as Romania under the Iron Guard, the revolutionary elements were not from Fascism. For Codreanu, the revolution was radical Orthodox Christianity mixed with Romanian ultranationalism. Even these radicals, much like Codreanu himself earlier, were suppressed by the Fascist Romanian government & annihilated after a failed coup attempt in 1943. I should mention that this coup attempt by the Legionnaire radicals was supportive of National Socialism, and the survivors fled to the sympathetic Germany.

Despite the machismo around Fascism, Mussolini himself even bent the knee when Hitler made it clear that Austria would be annexed & the 'Austrofascists' deposed. This behavior would come back around when his own party backstabbed him & surrendered to the allies in 1943.



The most significant difference is the topic of race. Fascism never had a specific racial policy, they actually went of their way to avoid it. The NFP had a plethora of Jewish members & supports, as well as sympathies for their allies in Arabia & Africa. This shouldn't be very surprising when you consider that Italy has always had a *questionable* ethnic makeup. I don't want to spread any slander like saying Sicilians are Black, but there's a wide gap between the north & south. Nothing crazy, but enough that it could be argued that they are different people from a biological standpoint. Germany & other countries in NW Europe don't have as much of a problem, and can consider themselves a single ethnicity much easier. This gets in the way of discussions about ethnic nationalism.

National Socialism begins with race. It doesn't waste time with pure ideology or universalism, it first determines what arises naturally from the blood of its constituents. Under NS, it's simply impossible to even consider things like civic or "cultural" nationalism as these things are downstream of ethnicity. I will touch on the importance of this in the modern day later.

An interesting tangent is that the divide between Fascism & NS closely resembles the divide between Catholicism & Protestants. I have said before that the Protestant Reformation was, aside of any ideological differences, an ethnic phenomenon. The differences are mirrored by those of the old Roman pagan religion & Germanic pagan religion, most notably in centralization. The Reformation was inevitable because the centralized nature of the Catholic Church & its dogma is simply alien to the Germanic man. It could never last.

The divide between Fascism & NS is similar, NS could never have arisen in Italy. It was articulated by Hitler due to his own unique experience as a German man watching the collapse of the multi-ethnic Habsburg Empire during a time where racial science was at its peak. He was fully aware that such an Empire was like putting a pitbull & a labrador in a cage & expecting them to behave the same. It could only exist somewhere in NW Europe, while Fascism is starkly similar to previous ideas to sprout out of Rome.

Why does it matter?



Despite the differences I laid out, many of you probably still question whether or not the distinction is actually relevant to us today beyond intellectual discussion. More importantly, is the topic even useful in an age that's so far from either worldview that it seems like nitpicking to see them as anything other than allies against the *woke mob*.

The importance is two-fold.

Firstly, Fascism isn't revolutionary. Something I strongly believe, & will expand on in the near future, is that the Right will eventually be separated between a progressive/revolutionary camp & a conservative/reactionary one. This process is already playing out today. There are those on the Right that want to radically change society at all levels, from system of government to the economic structure to individual morality. This includes everyone from National Socialists to figures like Bronze Age Pervert, people that want to systematically change the conversation instead trying to fix a sinking ship.

The conservatives & reactionaries don't want this, they just want the status quo. They either want things to stop because "*woke went too far*" or want to turn the clock back to the 1950's. Fascism was the same way, they didn't want a new world order but rather a simple change of government. The true revolutionaries like Russolini & Marinetti were ignored & backstabbed once their usefulness came to an end.

The issue with this is that the modern West yearns for revolution, not the status quo. Even the most lukewarm voices have taken aim at the established order, you can see this in Trump's second term. Far from simply pumping the breaks on the leftist tide, he has decided to take relatively radical measures against the US government & financial system. Trump surely isn't any revolutionary, but his (& his supporters') move to shake up the established order is a step towards revolution - towards *change*. Conservatism is a losing strategy, the RW of today is well aware that things have gone too far & a radical shift is necessary. They've already started looking towards exotic philosophers like Nietzsche or Evola to base their worldview around, rather than those that are credited with creating the modern West.

The West is dead, it served its purpose & has become a decaying corpse. As the old saying goes, "*liberals are rooting for the maggots while conservatives root for the corpse.*" National Socialist Germany was not Western, in the Spenglerian sense. It was a harsh departure from the foundations of the West in every way, over a long enough timeframe it would be considered as separate from the West as China is today. As the younger generations lose their nostalgia for times gone by, the clinging to the West will only decrease as people look for something new to replace it. New values, morality, systems, mythology, everything. The reactionaries will either fall in line or die, as the only people who win are the ones who actually *want* to win.

Secondly, the most important topic of our time is the race issue - especially in America. Fascism, on its own, doesn't fix this. If Trump declared himself a reincarnation of Mussolini right now, we would still be stuck with all the mongrels we have now & a soon-to-be White minority. If anything, it would be worse because the newly authoritarian government would likely take aim at revolutionaries including NatSocs, White nationalists, & any sort of anti-Zionist. Just like Dolfuss did to the NatSocs in Austria in the 30's.

This isn't just a personal opinion either. Race is quickly becoming the principal issue on the Right, the outcry against illegal immigration & eventually immigration in general was only the start. Euphemisms. The recent murder of a White teenager by a Black, and the reactions to this among RW influencers, shows that our people are tired of being forced to live around the brown horde. The most popular of these influencers are already outright White nationalists, beyond even the old AltRight. Reactionary figures like Joel Barry & James Lindsay now feel the need to take aim at the new RW, White advocacy is no longer a niche or fringe topic. I should also mention that these figures do not get much support when they do this, usually being harshly ratio'd.

Racial egalitarianism is dying, even the deepest roots of it (The idea of race as "social construct" & the "Blank Slate" theory, for example) is being dismissed by the popularization of suppressed racial science. Ten years ago, this was just a few people posting IQ averages on forum boards. Today, it's practically required to be considered RW. Fascism is not equipped to deal with this, it cannot be an eventual outlet of this sentiment. National Socialism, as a biological worldview, is uniquely suited for it.

Essentially, we can have Fascism right now. Trump can recreate America in the image of the Federation in *Starship Troopers*. It would fix nothing. We would still have a demographic crisis. We would still have the neurotic 'gender war.' We would still have the current economic system. We would still watch the degradation of the environment. Fascism cannot save us any better than a normal conservative controlled government. The time for these half measures has long since passed, the future is in revolution. A fundamental change in the worldview of society at large, an event on par with Nietzsche's prophesied "*reevaluation of all values*." I would argue they're one & the same. It is absolutely imperative that the champions of this revolution do not get caught up in mind traps of conservatism or reluctance to upset the status quo. National Socialism, as an entire worldview rather than simple political ideology, is uniquely capable of achieving this. The alternative is the leftist revolutionaries, which have already begun doing away with the moderates in their parties.

> *For this reason alone a worldview which is of an aggressive character is more definite in plan and more powerful and decisive in action than a worldview which takes up a merely defensive attitude. If force be used to combat a spiritual power, that force remains a defensive measure only so long as the wielders of it are not the* ***champions and apostles of a new spiritual doctrine.***
>
> *Summing up, we arrive at the conclusion that every attempt to combat a worldview by means of force will turn out futile in the end, if the struggle fails to take the form of* ***an offensive for the establishment of an entirely new spiritual order of things.***
>
> *It is only in the struggle between two worldviews that physical force, consistently and ruthlessly applied, will eventually turn the scales in its own favor. It was in this that the* ***fight against Marxism had hitherto failed.***
>
> -Adolf Hitler, Mein Kampf Chapter V

Another topic I want to touch on is the modern Fascists. That is, those who go out of their way to differentiate themselves from National Socialism in the same manner I am now. Unsurprisingly, this is a minor threat. The only notable organization that comes to mind is the *American Blackshirt Party*, which is small & unnoticeable even by the standards of RW activist groups. The only time I have seen a large number of people claim the position of "Fascism without Nazism" was around 2019, during the time where Traditional Catholics were a big thing. This is understandable, National Socialism is diametrically opposed to Catholicism, while Giovanni Gentile went out of his way to ensure that his *Doctrine of Fascism* was compatible with Church doctrine. These types tend to be sympathetic towards the Austrifascists, as well as paradoxically sympathetic to the Iron Guard.

Although I met a few clever individuals back in 2019, none of them stuck around. They either cut the nonsense & became NS, or simply moved away from the term Fascism entirely. The general riffraff that still cling to this thought process tend to fall into two groups, people that are still scared of being called racist & Catholics. Neither of which are people who have the guts to champion an ideology, let alone cause any real change. This crowd also attracts a lot of hispanics that are excluded from pro-White groups for obvious reasons, but still want to be a RW radical.

Most importantly, they're all useless. The previously mentioned organization is hardly known about even among those knowledgeable on RW activism (I promise this is the first & last time 99% of you have heard of them.) Most of their posters/stickers can easily be confused with basic Republican Party stuff. That is to say, these people aren't a threat.

The threat is otherwise good people falling into rabbit holes while reading Fascist literature & poisoning their minds by thinking it's relevant to National Socialism because they erroneously think they're the same. This is what I hope to prevent with this article. I have no issue with people taking inspiration from people like Franco or Mussolini. My own original political awakening towards radicalism was due in large part by Codreanu's *For My Legionnaires*, and he remains a personal favorite among historical figures. But seeing them as the same is an issue that leads to nothing but ideological & cognitive dissonance. Especially figures like Franco, who held power & popularity until the 1970's & still failed to prevent Spain from turning towards liberal democracy before his body was even cold.

The equation of every RW regime to exist in the interwar period wasn't organic, it was the beginning of leftists calling everything they don't like Fascist. The reason they call everything Fascist is because their 1920's equivalents only had Italy to go off of, therefore every ideological enemy afterwards were derisively referred to as such. By such logic, everyone to the right of Bernie Sanders truly is '*literally Hitler*.' Since Fascism quickly became irrelevant as it was completely eclipsed by Hitler's Germany, calling everything Fascist became calling everything Nazism. Purge your mind of Marxian philosophy.

Hail Victory.

Subscribe to ICØNØCLAST
By Der Einzige · Launched a year ago
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.
Type your email... Subscribe
By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.

100 Likes • 25 Restacks

100 39 25 Share

Discussion about this post

Comments Restacks

Write a comment...

American Sovereignty Apr 9
Liked by Der Einzige

Interesting article and I agree with your point that NS and NFP are necessarily distinct in really important ways. I think the issue with America is that it's so multicultural that it DEMANDS an autocratic ruler to keep everyone in line. To that end, an actual autocrat, not Trump's posturing of one, would be able to bring order and prosperity. In Europe, however, your program of NS makes more sense.

I am myself a trad Catholic and a big fan of Franco. While it's true that he invested power into the wrong hands by trying to restore the Spanish monarchy into the hands of a liberal and corrupt prince, it's also not difficult to imagine what could have been had the prince been a die hard traditionalist with instincts similar to Franco.

LIKE (9) REPLY SHARE

3 replies

vinalla Apr 8
Liked by Der Einzige

Great article.

In terms of the natsoc worldview, would you say it is explicitly anti-Christian or merely ambivalent? That is, would the transvaluation of all values require a rejection in toto of all Christian morality, except that which is useful?

Or in other words, is Christianity too foreign of a religion for the Volk to claim? I understand why NatSocs would be anti Catholic, but what about a more militant strand of Protestantism (one that doesn't exist today but conceivably *could* exist, rejecting all the dogmas of postwar liberal morality)?

LIKE (7) REPLY SHARE

5 replies by Der Einzige and others

37 more comments...

Top Latest Discussions

Depopulation
This is another article taking aim at something that's generally associated with the left, and recontextualizing it.
SEP 26, 2024 • DER EINZIGE

Zero Tolerance
Stop pretending enemies are friends.
AUG 1, 2024 • DER EINZIGE

Winds of Change
America, & Europe, have moved massively to the Right.
MAR 2 • DER EINZIGE

See all

Discover more from ICØNØCLAST
Newsletter to spread the word of Revolutionary National Socialism & monitor the Collapse. Hail Victory.
Enter your email...
Subscribe
By subscribing, I agree to Substack's Terms of Use, and acknowledge its Information Collection Notice and Privacy Policy.
Already have an account? Sign in